

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LAREDO DIVISION

United States Court
Southern District of Texas
RECEIVED
JAN 10 2025
Nathan Ochisner, Clerk
Laredo Division
BM

CYNTHIA ARADILLAS,
Pro Se Plaintiff,

V.

LAREDO COLLEGE,
Defendant,

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

5:21-cv-00160

PRO SE PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO (Dkt. 109)
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PRO SE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
OVERDUE FINAL JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DR. ARADILLAS
AND
REPEATS THE MOTION FOR FINAL JUDGMENT IN
TRADITIONAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DR. ARADILLAS
MOTION FOR A HEARING

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE DIANA SALDAÑA:

NOW COMES DR. CYNTHIA ARADILLAS., as a reluctant Pro Se Plaintiff in the above entitled and numbered cause, Dr. Aradillas files this PRO SE PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO (Dkt. 109) DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PRO SE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR OVERDUE FINAL JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DR. ARADILLAS and - REPEATS THE MOTION FOR FINAL JUDGMENT IN TRADITIONAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DR. ARADILLAS and makes this MOTION FOR A HEARING. Pro Se Plaintiff, Dr. Cynthia Aradillas files her Motion for a hearing pursuant to her Traditional Motion for Summary Judgment under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure under Rule 56. Summary Judgment and Rule 78. Hearing Motions; Submission on Briefs.

Dr. Aradillas has NOT made any "*false and conclusory allegations*". The fact is Dr. Aradillas has won her Traditional Motion for Summary Judgment under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: Rule 56.

Summary Judgment, in the above referenced case and would respectfully show unto the court as follows:

Defendant's Inaccurate Statement

"Pro Se Plaintiff's Motion for Overdue Final Judgment in Favor of Dr. Aradillas" (ECF No. 108), which makes false and conclusory allegations that she has filed four unopposed summary judgment motions. This Motion is in violation of this Court's prior Order, ECF No. 89, which set forth a briefing schedule that Plaintiff has refused to adhere to, and which Plaintiff in the instant Motion